	I						
1 2 3 4 5	Mont The 0 3200 Phoe 602-2 602-2 steph	nen Montoya (#011791) toya, Jimenez & Pastor, P.A. Great American Tower North Central Avenue, Ste. 2550 enix, Arizona 85012 256-6718 (telephone) 256-6667 (fax) nen@montoyalawgroup.com					
6	Attorney for Plaintiff IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
7 8							
9	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA						
10	Franl	k Cheatham,	No.				
11	Plain	tiff,	COMPLAINT				
12	V.		(Jury Trial Demanded)				
13	City	of Phoenix	(dury Trial Demanded)				
14	Defendant. For his Complaint against Defendant, Plaintiff alleges the following: 1. This is an action seeking money damages and equitable relief against the City of Phoenix for the violation of the federal civil rights of its employed.						
15 16 17							
18		•					
19 20		-	suant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of				
21		1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000e, as amen	ded.				
22	2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C						
23	§§1331 and 1343(4).						
24	3.	Venue is proper in this District u	nder 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and 42 U.S.C.				
25	§2000e-5(f)(3), because the events giving rise to this Complaint transpired						
26	in Arizona.						
27							
28							
	i						

- 4. Frank Cheatham is a citizen of the United States of America residing in Phoenix, Arizona.
- 5. Defendant City of Phoenix (the "City") is a municipal corporation in the State of Arizona.
- 6. The City has been engaged in an industry affecting commerce and has had at least fifteen employees for each working day in at least twenty calendar weeks this year or last year at all times material to this Complaint.
- 7. Mr. Cheatham began his employment with the City of Phoenix Fire Department as a Firefighter in 1979 and is still employed by the Phoenix Fire Department.
- 8. Mr. Cheatham's job performance during his thirty-four year tenure with the Phoenix Fire Department has been uniformly excellent, as reflected by the fact that the Fire Department has repeatedly promoted him to positions of increasing responsibility within the Fire Department.
- 9. Specifically, during his career with the City of Phoenix Fire Department, the Department promoted Chief Cheatham to the positions of Fire Engineer, Fire Captain, Fire Battalion Chief, and Fire Battalion Deputy Chief Shift Commander.
- Chief Cheatham has never been disciplined in over three decades of loyal,
 diligent service to the Phoenix Fire Department.
- 11. In approximately November 2009, while acting in his official capacity as a "Deputy Chief Shift Commander" of "South Shift Command," Chief Cheatham saw several inappropriate, sexually suggestive drawings and

- items—specifically, two depictions of a penis and testicles—openly displayed in the workplace at Fire Station 1.
- 12. The inappropriate sexual drawings and items were brought to Chief Cheatham's attention by a Fire Captain on Chief Cheatham's staff who acted as Chief Cheatham's Assistant.
- 13. The inappropriate sexual drawings and items of which Chief Cheatham complained violated the Fire Department's policies prohibiting sexually offensive conduct in the workplace.
- 14. Chief Cheatham also reasonably believed that the sexual drawings and items of which he complained violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because they were creating a sexually hostile work environment.
- 15. Accordingly, pursuant to his official duties with the Fire Department, Chief Cheatham admonished the supervisors at Fire Station 1 that such drawings were inappropriate and would <u>not</u> be tolerated in the future.
- 16. After Chief Cheatham admonished the supervisors of Fire Station 1 regarding the sexually inappropriate drawings and items in the workplace, the Battalion Chief who supervised Fire Station 1 asked Chief Cheatham and Chief Cheatham's assistant to no longer take their meals at Fire Station 1, where both Chief Cheatham and his assistant often took their meals while at work.
- 17. The same Battalion Chief at Fire Station 1 also told Chief Cheatham that the firefighters at Fire Station 1 would never trust Chief Cheatham's assistant again and considered him to be a spy for Chief Cheatham.

- 18. Soon after Chief Cheatham complained of the inappropriate sexual drawings and items, when he was exercising at a gym located at the Phoenix Fire Department, he saw a t-shirt bearing another drawing of a penis and testicles draped over a piece of gym equipment.
- 19. Soon thereafter, Chief Cheatham received a large brown envelope in interoffice mail containing two small pieces of pasta, one of which resembled a penis and the other of which resembled a vagina.
- 20. The piece of pasta resembling a vagina had Chief Cheatham's first name ("Frank") written on it.
- 21. Soon thereafter, in February of 2010, Chief Cheatham began hearing rumors in the Department that he would be removed from his position as Deputy Chief Shift Commander of South Shift Command.
- 22. In March of 2010, Chief Cheatham was officially informed by telephone by his supervisors at the Phoenix Fire Department that the Department had in fact decided to remove him from his position of Deputy Chief Shift Commander of South Shift Command and involuntarily transfer him to the Department's "Safety Division."
- 23. Chief Cheatham's job duties at the Fire Department's "Safety Division" are undefined, do <u>not</u> involve the supervision of firefighters, do <u>not</u> require him to exercise his management skills, and leave him with little to do all day.
- 24. Moreover, in his position at the Fire Department's Safety Division, Chief Cheatham has <u>no</u> direct reports, <u>no</u> staff, and <u>no</u> subordinates.

- 25. In stark contrast, while serving as Deputy Chief Shift Commander of South Shift Command, Chief Cheatham had three full-time staff members, directly supervised four battalion chiefs, and indirectly supervised approximately 440 firefighters.
- 26. In addition, Chief Cheatham has less favorable working hours in his new position in the Safety Division than the hours that he enjoyed in his position as Deputy Fire Chief Shift Commander of South Shift Command.
- 27. Chief Cheatham's position in the Fire Department's Safety Division has far less prestige than his former position of Deputy Chief Shift Commander of South Shift Command.
- 28. The Fire Department's involuntary transfer of Chief Cheatham from Deputy
 Chief Shift Commander of South Shift Command to the Department's
 Safety Division constitutes a substantive, <u>de facto</u> demotion.
- 29. The harassment, demotion, and involuntary transfer summarized above were in direct retaliation for Chief Cheatham's complaints of discrimination in the workplace at the Phoenix Fire Department.
- 30. Chief Cheatham repeatedly complained of the harassment and retaliation summarized above to the appropriate authorities at the City of Phoenix.
- 31. Notwithstanding Chief Cheatham's repeated complaints, the City failed to properly investigate his complaints, stop the harassment, and remediate the retaliation.

- 32. The City of Phoenix Fire Department is engaging in a pattern and practice of retaliating against its employees who complain of discrimination in the workplace.
- 33. The harassment and retaliation summarized above had a substantial negative impact on Chief Cheatham's employment and psychological well-being and continue to do so.
- 34. Based on the retaliatory conduct of the Phoenix Fire Department as summarized above, Chief Cheatham timely filed a Charge of Discrimination against the City with the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "EEOC") on June 1, 2010. See attached Exhibit A.
- 35. After investigating Chief Cheatham's Charge of Discrimination against the City of Phoenix, the EEOC concluded that:

I have considered all of the evidence obtained during the investigation and find there is reasonable cause to believe that Respondent [the City of Phoenix] violated Title VII when it subjected Charging Party [Frank Cheatham] to unlawful sexual harassment and retaliated against him for complaining about a sexually hostile work environment. The retaliation included failing to take appropriate action against a subordinate employee who sent Charging Party a letter that was retaliatory in nature and demoting Charging Party.

See attached Exhibit B.

- 36. Chief Cheatham received a Right to Sue Letter from the United States

 Department of Justice on approximately January 10, 2013 and timely
 commenced this action within ninety days of his receipt of that letter.
 - **Wherefore**, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to:

1	A.	Issue a declaratory judgment that the retaliatory conduct of						
2		Defendant as described above violated Plaintiff's rights under Title VII						
3	of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000e, as amended;							
4	В.	Award Plaintiff nominal damages in the amount of \$1.00;						
5								
6 7	0.	C. Issue an injunction ordering the City not to retaliate against Plaintiff in						
8		the future;						
9	D.	Award Plaintiff compensatory and punitive damages against						
10	Defendant in an amount to be determined at trial;							
11	E.	Award Plaintiff his attorney's fees and costs under 42 U.S.C. §1988,						
12	42 U.S.C §2000e-5(k) and any other applicable law; and							
13	F.	Award Plaintiff all other relief just and appropriate under the						
14		circumstances.						
15		Respectfully submitted this 29 th day of March 2013.						
16 17		ricopositally capitalised time 20 day of Maron 2010.						
18		MONTOYA, JIMENEZ & PASTOR, P.A.						
19		<u>s/ Stephen Montoya</u> Stephen Montoya						
20		3200 North Central Avenue, Ste. 2550						
21		Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Attorney for Plaintiff						
22								
23								
24								
25	I hereby certify that on March 29, 2013, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF System for filing and							
26	transmittal	of a Notice of Electronic Filing.						
27								
28	s/ Stephen Montoya							

EXHIBIT A

							
CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION	Cha	arge Presented To:	Agency(ies) Charge No(s):				
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act		FEPA	rigency(les) Charge No(s):				
Statement and other information before completing this form.		X EEOC	540-2010-02623				
Arizona Attorney General's	Office Civil						
	Agency, if any	Rights Division	and EEOC				
Name (indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.)	<u>.u</u>	ea Code) Date of Birth					
Mr. Franklin H. Cheatham							
Street Address City, State and ZiP Code							
with a series of a series of a series of a							
		•					
Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprentice Discriminated Against Me or Others. (If more than two, list under PARTICULA	ship Committee,	or State or Local Governm	ent Agency That I Believe				
Name	RS Delow.)		-				
PHOENIX CITY OF (FIRE DEPARTMENT)		No. Employees, Members 500 or More	[mailed , mad bode)				
Street Addrage	ate and ZiP Code	300 DI MIDIE	(602) 262-7775				
2625 S 19th Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85003							
Name	·	No. Employees, Members	Phone No. (Include Area Code)				
			(and the familiary wear 0000)				
Street Address City, Sta	te and ZIP Code	<u> </u>	<u>. I</u>				
	•						
DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
ON (Clieck appropriate box(es).)		DATE(S) DISCF Earliest	RIMINATION TOOK PLACE Latest				
X RACE COLOR X SEX RELIGION	NATIONAL ORIGIN 04/04201						
X RETALIATION AGE DISABILITY G	GENETIC INFORMATION						
OTHER (Specify)	CONTINUING ACTION						
THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attach extra sheet(s)):							
Lhegan my amployment an annual de							
I began my employment on approximately April 9, 1979; approximately November 4, 2009 I notified Bryant Johns suggestive pictures and items and items.	my current jo	b title is Deputy Ch	nief. On				
suggestive pictures and items posted at Fire Station 1	received a la	atter of inetruction for	com a subandin -t-				
that is mappropriate and no action was taken. On approx	ximately Apri	l 4, 2010 I was tran	offi a supordinate				
demoted to the position of Safety Chief.	• •	,, ==	ononiou uniu				
believe that I have been discriminated against because							
I believe that I have been discriminated against because for opposing practices made unlawful under Title VII of the	ormy race, t e Civil Right	Black; sex, male; ar	nd retaliated against				
	o ojim ragija	3 Act of 1304, as a	riended,				
			,				
	*	•					
want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any.	NOTARY - Whos	nococco for Clate - //					
will advise the agencies if I change my address or phone number and I will coperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their	NOTARY – When necessary for State and Local Agency Requirements						
rocedures.	swear or affirm	that I have read the above	re charge and that it is true to				
declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.	the pest of my k	knowledge, information and	belief.				
	SIGNATURE OF	COMPLAINANT					
of an ancha	étinconie	m aurani					
Jun 01, 2010 Stall With	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE (month, day, year)						
Date Charging Party Signature							
·			<u> </u>				

EXHIBIT B



U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION Phoenix District Office

3300 N. Central Avenue, Suite 690 Phoenix, AZ, 85012-2504 (602) 640-5000 TTY (602) 640-5072 FAX (602) 640-5071

Charge No. 540-2010-02623

Franklin H. Cheatham

Charging Party

Phoenix City of (Fire Department) 2625 South 19th Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85003

Respondent

DETERMINATION

I issue the following determination on the merits of this charge.

Respondent is an employer within the meaning of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, (Title VII). Timeliness and all other requirements for coverage have been met.

Charging Party alleged that he discovered sexually suggestive items in the workplace and reported this to Respondent. Charging Party alleged that after putting Respondent on notice about the sexually tainted work environment, he was: subjected to sexual harassment; received a retaliatory letter of instruction from a subordinate; and was transferred and demoted to the position of Safety Chief.

I have considered all of the evidence obtained during the investigation and find there is reasonable cause to believe that Respondent violated Title VII when it subjected Charging Party to unlawful sexual harassment and retaliated against him for complaining about a sexually hostile work environment. The retaliation included failing to take appropriate action against a subordinate employee who sent Charging Party a letter that was retaliatory in nature and demoting Charging Party.

The Commission makes no finding regarding any other allegation made in the charge.

This determination is final. When the Commission finds that violations have occurred, it attempts to eliminate the alleged unlawful practices by informal methods of conciliation. Therefore, I invite the parties to join with the Commission in reaching a just resolution of this matter. Disclosure of information obtained by the Commission during the conciliation process will be made only in accordance with the confidentiality provisions of Title VII and Commission Regulations.

If the Respondent wishes to accept this invitation to participate in conciliation efforts, it may do so at this time by proposing terms for a conciliation agreement. Those terms should be provided to the Commission representative, Julie Hammer, at 602-640-5048 within 14 days of the date of this determination. The remedies for violations of the statutes we enforce are designed to make the identified victims whole, and to provide corrective and preventative relief. These remedies may include, as appropriate, an agreement by the Respondent not to engage in unlawful employment practices, placement of identified victims in positions they would have held but for discriminatory actions, back pay, restoration of lost benefits, injunctive relief, compensatory and/or punitive damages, and notice to employees of the violation(s) and the resolution of the charge.

Should the Respondent have further questions regarding the conciliation process or the conciliation terms it would like to propose, we encourage it to contact the assigned Commission representative. Should there be no response from the Respondent within 14 days, we may conclude that further conciliation efforts in this matter would be futile or non-productive.

On behalf of the Commission:

MAR 2 9 2012

Date

Rayford O. Irvin

District Director

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

T () DY A TAPPY DETC	ocker sileer. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT TAGE C	7 111370				<u> </u>		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Frank Cheatham				DEFENDANTS City of Phoenix	•				
(b) County of Residence o	f First Listed Plaintiff N	Maricopa		County of Residence	of First List	ed Defendant			
(E.	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA			Í		LAINTIFF CASES O	NLY)		
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATI FOF LAND IN	ON CASES, USE TH IVOLVED.	HE LOCATION (OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Stephen Montoya, Monto 3200 North Central Ave.,	ya, Jimenez & Pastor	<i>r)</i> , P.A.		Attorneys (If Known)					
Phoenix, Arizona 85012									
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government				(For Diversity Cases Only) P	TF DEF		and One Box fo	or Dejenaai PTF	nt) DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citiza	en of This State	11 🗆 1	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		□ 4	□ 4
U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	2 🗆 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		□ 5	☐ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation	•	□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Or	ıly)							
CONTRACT				DREETURE PENALTY			OTHER		<u>s</u>
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -	X 1 62	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appe	al 28 USC 158	375 False C		
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	G 69	0 Other		SC 157	 400 State Re 410 Antitrus 		nent
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	☐ 367 Health Care/					☐ 430 Banks a		g
150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				RTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Comme		
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			 □ 820 Copy □ 830 Paten 		☐ 460 Deporta ☐ 470 Rackete		bac bac
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Personal	:		☐ 840 Trade			Organizati	
Student Loans	340 Marine	Injury Product					☐ 480 Consun		
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability		LABOR		SECURITY	☐ 490 Cable/S		
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud	CIX U 71	U Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA (☐ 862 Black		☐ 850 Securiti Exchan		dities/
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	☐ 72	0 Labor/Management		C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 890 Other S		ctions
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Personal		Relations	☐ 864 SSID	Title XVI	☐ 891 Agricul	tural Acts	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage 385 Property Damage		Railway Labor Act Family and Medical	□ 865 RS1 (405(g))	☐ 893 Environ		
	☐ 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability	10 /3	Leave Act			☐ 895 Freedor Act	n or mom	ianon
	Medical Malpractice			0 Other Labor Litigation			☐ 896 Arbitrat		
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	YS 79	1 Employee Retirement		L TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Admini		
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	1	s (U.S. Plaintiff		iew or App	cal of
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	M 442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate	.			efendant) -Third Party	Agency 950 Constitu	Decision	æ
☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence	-			SC 7609	State St		•
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General			_				
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	535 Death Penalty Other:		IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application					
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 540 Mandamus & Oth	er 🖸 46	5 Other Immigration	`				
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights		Actions					
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition☐ 560 Civil Detainee -		•					
		Conditions of		-					
V ODICIN		Confinement			<u> </u>				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in									
		Remanded from [Appellate Court		stated or	r District	6 Multidistri Litigation	ct		
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you ar	e filing (I	o not cite jurisdictional stat S.C. §2000e, as am	tutes unless div	versity);			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca Employment discr	use:	1, 12 0.	3.3. <u>32</u> 3033, 43 4.11	ionaca.				
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION	J Di	EMAND \$	C	HECK YES only i	f demanded in	complain	1.
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2			WATER TEN TO		URY DEMAND:	X Yes	☐ No	L.
VIII. RELATED CASE									
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			4
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT		F RECORD					
03/29/2013		s/ Stephen Mor	ntoya						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # AN	OUNT .	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		